

| | | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/777,410 | BERKES ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Mark Connolly | 2115 | |

All Participants:

Status of Application: Allowed

(1) Mark Connolly.

(3) _____

(2) Erin Pacella (applicant's representative).

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 17 January 2007

Time: 10:30

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

N/A

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's representative was contacted to resolve an issue regarding the order of inventors between what was listed in the Oath and Application Data Sheet, both filed 12 Feb. 2004. It was clarified by applicant's representative that the Application Data Sheet indicated the correct order..